Eğitim ve Bilim
2009, Cilt 34, Sayı 153

Education and Science
2009, Vol. 34, No 153

Evaluation of English Curriculum at Yıldız Technical University Using CIPP Model

Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi İngilizce Öğretim Programının CIPP Modeli Kullanılarak Değerlendirilmesi

Hakan KARATAŞ* Seval FER**

Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi

Abstract

The aim of this research is to evaluate English II curriculum at YTU using Context, Input, Process and Product (CIPP) model. The universe of this research is composed of 35 teachers and 415 students. The source of data has been obtained through two forms of a single questionnaire for the teachers and students which consisted of 46 items. In this research, the data has been analyzed using the technique of independent samples t-test. From their responses to the scales representing the curriculum components such as context, input, process and product, it is concluded that, mostly, teachers and students tend to support all four of these curriculum components. However, according to the findings of the study, significant differences have been observed between the means of teachers' and students' opinions concerning certain items related with the context, input, process and product component of the curriculum. This result indicates that while the students' perceptions are higher, the teachers' expectations are higher for the items regarding the components of the curriculum. According to the findings obtained from teachers' opinions, it is essential that audio-visual materials must be varied and implemented properly in the activities. According to the students' opinions, the students' needs related with their fields and English knowledge necessary for business life must be determined.

K*ey Words:* CIPP model, context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation, product evaluation, curriculum.

Öz

Bu araştırmanın amacı, YTÜ İngilizce II öğretim programını bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün (CIPP) modeli ile değerlendirmektir. Araştırmanın evrenini, 35 öğretmen ve 415 öğrenci oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmanın veri kaynağı, 46 madde içeren tek tip anketin öğretmen ve öğrenciye yönelik iki formu ile elde edilmiştir. Araştırmada, bağımsız örneklemler için t-testi tekniği kullanılarak veriler analiz edilmiştir. Öğretmen ve öğrencilerin bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün gibi öğretim programının boyutlarını temsil eden ölçeklere verdikleri cevaplardan, genellikle öğretim programının dört boyutunu da destekleme eğiliminde oldukları sonucu çıkarılmıştır. Ancak, araştırma sonuçlarına göre, öğretim programının bağlam, girdi, süreç ve ürün boyutlarına ilişkin bazı maddelerde öğretmen ve öğrenci görüşlerinin ortalamaları arasında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Bu sonuç, öğretim programının boyutlarına ilişkin öğrencilerin algılarının daha yüksek olmasına karşın, öğretmenlerin beklentilerinin daha yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir. Araştırmada öğretmen görüşlerinden elde edilen bulgulara göre, görsel ve işitsel materyaller çeşitlendirilmeli ve etkinliklerde uygun bir şekilde kullanılmalıdır. Öğrenci görüşlerine göre, öğrencilerin alanları ve iş hayatı için gerekli olan İngilizce bilgisinin tespit edilmesi gereklidir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: CIPP modeli, bağlam değerlendirme, girdi değerlendirme, süreç değerlendirme, ürün değerlendirme, öğretim programı.

* Öğr. Gör. Hakan KARATAŞ, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi, Merkez Kampüs Rektörlük Özel Kalem Müdürlüğü Beşiktaş – İst. hakaratas@gmail.com,

** Doç. Dr. Seval FER, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Merkez Kampüs Rektörlük Özel Kalem Müdürlüğü Beşiktaş – İst. sevaler99@hotmail.com

Introduction

From elementary education to higher education, when the money and effort used up in foreign language instruction is considered, it is seen that the end results are not satisfactory. The inadequacy of the facilities required for foreign language acquisition and the existence of negativity influencing the language acquisition process might be among the reasons behind this condition. Not having been able to analyze this negativity has brought about inaccurate solution suggestions put forth. Actually, taking advantage of contemporary conditions and facilities efficiently can contribute to the solution of this problem (Aslan, 2003). It is known that the aim of foreign language teaching at universities is to be able to follow up scientific resources and write scientific articles. However, it has been observed that even after university graduation, students are still in search of learning foreign languages despite taking one-year English preparatory program and English classes during university education. This ascertainment brings forward the question of whether the implemented curriculums are satisfactory or not. Besides, this observation introduces the necessity of regular evaluation process to judge the competence of implemented curriculum. Evaluation in education is realized to define, clarify and set criteria and based on the criteria, to find out objective value, quality, benefit, performance and importance of the evaluation (Worthern, Sanders & Fitzpatrick, 1997; Middlewood & Burton, 2001). Moreover, evaluation is a continuous process which is applicable in planned or unplanned conditions (Gilchrist & Roberts, 1974; Kelly, 1999; Hamilton, 1976) and it aims to question the value of an object systematically (Sanders, 1994). To sum up, evaluation is a sophisticated concept which includes the phases of selecting the information, obtaining, analyzing, transferring, using and making a decision on the quality of the curriculum. This study aims to evaluate the English II curriculum of Yıldız Technical University. Evaluation serves to diagnose the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum before the implementation and determine the efficiency of the result after the implementation. The aim of collecting data related with the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum is to ensure the programmers to decide whether the curriculum should be revised, compared, continued or completed (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). Due to the diversity in curriculum development, it is not easy to suggest a single model for curriculum evaluation. In search of curriculum evaluation, researchers can choose the most appropriate model for their aims and conditions or develop a model benefiting from these models (Erden, 1995). It is crucial to be aware of the fact that the adopted evaluation model and accepted program planning model must comply with each other. Otherwise, there will be incongruity and distortion between these models (Kelly, 1999).

Worthern, Sanders and Fitzpatrick (1997) classify evaluation approaches into six groups such as objectives-oriented, management-oriented, consumer-oriented, expertise-oriented, adversary-oriented and participant-oriented approaches. Management-oriented evaluation approach is one of the most important approaches serving managers who are responsible for planning, implementing and evaluating programmes. In education, management-oriented evaluation approach provides managers with the information about the implemented program. Hence, the information obtained from evaluation must be the essential part of the decision process and evaluators must contribute to education serving managers, school administrations, teachers and people who need evaluation in education. In this approach, the objectives of the program are not the focal point of evaluation. Stufflebeam has been the pioneer of management-oriented evaluation approach so as to help managers be able to make correct decisions about the program (Worthern, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997). His evaluation approach is known as Context, Input, Process and Product Evaluation Model (CIPP). Since 1965, the CIPP evaluation model has been extensively developed and widely implemented (Candoli, Cullen, &

Stufflebeam, 1997; Gally, 1984; Granger, Grierson, Quirino, & Romano, 1965; Guba & Stufflebeam, 1968; Nevo, 1974; Stufflebeam, 1969, 1995, 1997-a, 2003-b; Stufflebeam, Candoli, & Nicholls, 1995; Stufflebeam, Gullickson, & Wingate, 2002; Stufflebeam & Millman, 1995; Stufflebeam & Nevo, 1976; Stufflebeam, & Webster, 1988; Webster, 1975).

The aim of the CIPP model which attaches importance to process evaluation is to look into all of the strategies and components of evaluation and to seek the answers to these questions. Is evaluation design functioning properly? Which points are possibly the problematic ones and how can these be solved? Are there more efficient ways to collect the data (Gilchrist & Roberts, 1974)? Stufflebeam (1973) suggests evaluators to follow these steps, as a logical structure, to be used in designing each evaluation type: focusing the evaluation, collection of information, organization of information, analysis of information, reporting of information and administration of evaluation (Wiles & Bondi, 2002; Stufflebeam, 1973, e.g., Worthern, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997).

One of the strengths of CIPP model is, especially, that it is a useful and simple tool for helping evaluators produce questions of vital importance to be asked in an evaluation process. Evaluators can determine lots of questions for each component of the CIPP model. Harrison (1993) emphasizes that the CIPP model enables evaluators to intervene the evaluation process when needed, both before and during the program and it also gives the possibility of evaluation for only one component. The CIPP evaluation model has some weaknesses, too. A potential weakness of this model is the evaluator's occasional inability to respond to some significant questions or issues. In planning evaluation procedures, evaluators need to consider the resources and time available. If this model requires more time or resources than are available, another model may have to be considered. (Worthern, Sanders & Fitzpatrick 1997).

In this research, Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model has been implemented. The reason why this model has been preferred is that it is feasible in foreign languages curricula and involves various evaluation types such as context, input, process and product evaluation. Therefore, within this framework, answers to the following questions have been sought in this research: (1) Is there a significant difference between arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' opinions regarding the context of the curriculum? (2) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the the students' and teachers' thoughts regarding the input of the curriculum? (3) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' thoughts regarding the process of the curriculum? (4) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' thoughts regarding the product of the curriculum? (5) Is there a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the students' and teachers' thoughts rgarding the context, input, process and product of the curriculum?

Method

Research Model

In this research, the opinions of teachers and students regarding the English II curriculum in 2005-2006 academic year were analyzed. Due to reflecting what really exists in the evaluation of four components of the curriculum in this research, as a research model the descriptive research model, which Karasar (1999) expresses as an explanation of an existing situation to give just a picture and Hovardaoğlu (2000) states as an explanation what the features of some events, beings and groups of people are singly explained or how two or more of their attributes function on a relational level, was implemented.

Universe and Sample Group

The universe of this research was composed of teachers and students of English II curriculum in the spring term of 2005-2006 academic year. While choosing teachers' sampling group, since the number of the teachers was not enough, opinions of all of thirty-five teachers teaching in seventy-one English II classes were drawn upon. Therefore, the study was implemented with teachers' universe. While choosing students'sampling group, the method of cluster random sampling was used. In this research, faculties were determined as clusters and the classes from all the faculties were chosen according to the rate of their representation of the universe composed of the students from different disciplines. The opinions of 415 students in these classes were used in this research.

Data Collecting Instruments

In this section, the preparation of CIPP questionnaire, the validity and reliability processes of CIPP questionnaire take place. In this research, the data was collected by two forms of a single questionnaire consisting of the same items for students and teachers. In order to find out answers to the questions of the research, the questionnaire was developed by the researcher in the frame of Stufflebeam's CIPP evaluation model principles. The questions in the questionnaire were in the form of five-point liekert scale: (1) *I definitely disagree*, (2) *I disagree*, (3) *I partly agree*, (4) *I agree*, (5) *I completely agree*. In the questionnaires, there were 62 items concerning teachers' and students' opinions about the English II curriculum. The questionnaires were prepared to cover four components of CIPP evaluation model constituting sub-problems of the research.

Validity

The initial version of the questionnaires obtained was then sent to five expert English teachers. These teachers were chosen because they were actively involved, for instance, in teaching English in prep classes, in designing and presenting new educational materials in English teaching, or in a testing office of English prep classes. These five teachers were asked to comment on the general structure of the set of statements, and to make comments and suggestions about specific items. In particular, they were asked to consider whether each statement could be scored by both teachers and students. Their responses varied in length and detail, but, in general, were of a positive and supportive nature. All five made many comments concerning specific statements. These comments were used to make changes in the formulation of almost every statement (e.g. so that they could be scored by teachers as well as students).

In this research, then it was decided to implement factor analysis for both teachers' and students' questionnaires. Before implementing factor analysis, Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was administered to determine the construct validity and measure the sampling adequacy. Since the number of teachers was only thirty-five, which was not enough for factor analysis, no result was obtained after administering KMO test for teachers' questionnaire. Hence, it was decided not to administer factor analysis for teachers' questionnaire. The result of KMO test administered for the students' questionnaire determined the value of P as 0.94. Bayram (2004) specifies that the closer the value of P in KMO test to 1.00 is, the more convenient it is to apply factor analysis for the sampling group. If the value of P in KMO test is lower than 0.50, it is not convenient to administer factor analysis. Barlett's Test of Sphericity is a preliminary test conducted to determine if three or more independent samples are homogenous or variant before proceeding with an analysis of variance. Barlett's test under taken for sphericity of data showed the value of P as 0.00 (14482.34, sd: 1891, p: 0.00). Since the value of P in KMO test was greater than 0.05 and value of P for Barlett's test was smaller than 0.05, validity of test, sampling adequacy and the factor analysis administered was confirmed.

Factor analysis was started with sixty-two items in the original form of the students'questionnaire. It was found that the original form of the students' questionnaire collected in twelve factors whose eigenvalues were greater than one, yet these factors couldn't be given any meaningful names. While preparing the items for the questionnaire, the items were considered in four dimensions, that is, four factors. These dimensions consisted of context, input, process and product evaluation. Therefore, the questionnaire was analyzed in four factors and an exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted to examine construct validity of the questionnaire. As Büyüköztürk (2002) emphasizes, in a condition in which the same item has high factor loading in two different factors, the difference must be at least 0.10, the factor loadings of the items must be at least 0.45 and the items must be grouped under a single factor. All these things considered, the sixteen items (3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 44, 51, 57) whose factor loadings were under 0.45 and collected under two different factors with high factor loadings were removed from the questionnaire. The results of factor analysis for the students' questionnaire addressed the four dimensional constructs with 46 items. After removing the items mentioned above from the questionnaire, KMO test was readministered and the results of KMO test determined the value of P as 0.94. Hence, applying factor analysis for the students' questionnaire was confirmed. Validity analysis is reported in Table 1.

Tablo 1.
Factor Loadings of CIPP Students' Questionnaire After Varimax Rotation

Factor 1 Eigenvalue= 8.98 Variance%= 19.54			Factor 2 Eigenvalue= 5.56 Variance%= 12.08			Factor 3 Eigenvalue= 4.88 Variance%= 10.62			Factor 4 Eigenvalue= 4.68 Variance%= 10.19		
IN	CV	FL	IN	CV	FL	IN	CV	FL	IN	CV	FL
61	.35	.77	1	.45	.71	42	.36	.82	27	.29	.73
62	.38	.75	20	.51	.65	46	.32	.80	26	.26	.72
55	.38	.74	24	.55	.63	43	.37	.79	30	.32	.72
59	.24	.74	22	.53	.57	40	.35	.79	25	.27	.72
52	.36	.70	10	.52	.54	47	.39	.77	29	.37	.70
58	.27	.69	9	.48	.52	41	.41	.76	28	.33	.69
60	.43	.68	17	.67	.49	38	.41	.74			
54	.49	.67	13	.68	.49	39	.41	.73			
56	.53	.65	21	.45	.49						
50	.35	.61	11	.53	.49						
53	.46	.57									
7	.40	.59									
45	.48	.55									
6	.40	.55									
31	.48	.52									
49	.55	.52									
4	.41	.51									
8	.52	.51									
48	.50	.50									
37	.42	.48									
2	.44	.46									
5	.47	.45									

IN: Item number CV: Covariance YD: Factor loading

As it is seen in Table 1, as a result of varimax rotation, the covariance of the items ranged from 0.24 to 0.68 and their factor loadings ranged from 0.46 to 0.82. The total variance explained by four factors was %52.44 (%19.54 by the first factor, %12.08 by the second factor, %10.62 by

the third factor and %10.19 by the fourth factor). As the result of varimax rotation, the factor groupings and the dimensions these factors intended to measure are shown in Table 2.

Table 2.
Distribution of the Factors According to Their Names and Items

Factors	Competences	Items
1. Factor	Product Evaluation	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 31, 37, 45, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62
2. Factor	Process Evaluation	38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47
3. Factor	Input Evaluation	25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30
4. Factor	Context Evaluation	1, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24

As it is viewed in Table 2, the total number of items belonging to four factors is 46, as 22 items in the first factor, 8 items in the second factor, in the third factor and 10 items in the fourth factor. Analyzing the items of the factors in the questionnaire, the factors were given meaningful names considering the common features of the items grouped under the factors and competences aimed to be measured. 22 items under the first factor were named as "Product Evaluation", 8 items under the second factor as "Process Evaluation", 6 items under the third factor as Input Evaluation and 10 items under the fourth factor as "Context Evaluation".

Reliability of CIPP Students' Questionnaire

Examining whether each factor was measuring a single idea and whether the items that made up the factors were internally consistent, internal reliability data was obtained through Cronbach's alpha coefficient among the 4 factors. This is a measure of internal consistency and based on the hypothesis that the measuring instrument is composed of the independent units to fulfill a definite purpose and these units have equal weights that are already known (Karasar, 1999). The questionnaire consists of independent components of the program such as context, input, process and product. In Table 3, the Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients and the values of item-total correlation of the components are shown.

Table 3.
Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients and Item-total Correlations of the Components

Competences	Item Numbers	A	r
Context Evaluation	1, 9, 10, 11, 13, 17, 20, 21, 22, 24	.81	.42 - .59
Input Evaluation	25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30	.87	.64 - .70
Process Evaluation	38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 46, 47	.92	.69 - .77
Product Evaluation	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 31, 37, 45, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62	.94	.51 - .77

A: Alpha values r: Item-total correlation

As it is shown in Table 3, the reliability coefficients of four components ranged from 0.81 to 0.94 and the reliability coefficient of the whole questionnaire was found to be 0.95. Any reliability coefficient at or above .70 is considered "acceptable" in social sciences. The coherence level increases when reliability coefficient approaches to 1.00, and decreases as it approaches to 0 (Turgut, 1997; Yıldırım, 1999). In accordance with the reference mentioned above, the internal consistency indicated reasonably high reliability. Internal reliability on each scale was also obtained via item-scale correlation. Findings showed that the four factors had internal consistency reliabilities ranging from 0.42 to 0.77. Pearson's correlations that were significant at the 0.01 level indicated acceptable internal reliability.

Analysis of Data

Because the measure instruments were designed as a five-point likert scale, the number value ranging from 1 to 5 was determined for each answer to be able to carry out the analysis. Therefore, the number values used for the options were determined as 5 for "I completely agree", 4 for "I agree", 3 for "I partly agree", 2 for "I disagree" and 1 for "I definitely disagree". The total point of the questionnaire was 230 (context component 50, input component 30, process component 40 and product component 110). The data obtained via the questionnaires was transferred into the computer and the calculations were made using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 13 program as statistical techniques. For data analysis, the means, frequency and standard deviation of the opinions of the teachers and students were found. As the questionnaires were designed as a five-point likert scale, the means of the opinions of the teachers and students were used and the point intervals were as follows; 1 and 1.79 as "I definitely disagree", 1.80-2.59 as "I disagree", 2.60-3.39 as "I partly agree", 3.40-4.19 as "I agree" and 4.20-5 as "I completely agree". These intervals were calculated by the formula of 5-1= 4 and 4/5 =0.80. The statistics obtained were transferred into the tables by grouping and then interpreted. In order to find the answers to the sub-problems of the research, the means and frequency of the opinions of the teachers and students collected with the questionnaires were analyzed using the technique of independent samples t-test.

Results

In Table 4, the analysis of the teachers' and the students' opinions regarding the context component of the program is given.

Tablo 4.
The Mean, Standard Deviation and t test Results Related with the Context Component

Context Evaluation	Teacher N= 35		Student N= 415				
Item Number	$\bar{X}$	SS	$\bar{X}$	SS	t	sd	P
1. The curriculum is appropriate for the improvement of the students' language skills.	3.42	1.06	3.86	.97	2.53	448	.01*
3. The reading, writing, listening and speaking skills are balanced well in the curriculum.	2.91	.85	3.14	.89	1.49	448	.13
9. The objectives of the curriculum meet the needs of the students regarding English.	3.11	.75	3.28	.92	1.06	448	.29
10. The curriculum has measurable objectives.	3.37	.68	3.09	.87	1.83	448	.06
13. The objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students' preliminary knowledge of English.	2.77	1.03	3.53	1.05	4.14	448	.00*
17. The level of the difficulty of the topics in the curriculum complies with their duration.	3.02	1.07	3.28	.95	1.52	448	.12
20. The total duration of the curriculum is adequate.	3.14	.84	3.46	1.12	1.64	448	.10
21. The coursebook of the curriculum is appropriate for the students' level.	3.11	.86	3.70	.89	3.76	448	.00*
22. The coursebook attracts the students' attention.	2.48	.91	2.76	1.00	1.58	448	.11
24. The content of the coursebook is comprehensible.	2.94	.90	3.39	.94	2.75	448	.00*
Total	30.48	1.03	33.39	.29	2.77	448	.00*

* p< .05

As it is seen in Table 4, there are some significant differences between the arithmetical means of the teachers' and students' opinions regarding the context component of the curriculum. Some significant differences between the arithmetical means of the teachers' and students' opinions were determined about the following items, "The curriculum is appropriate for the improvement of the students' language skills" [t=2.53 (448), p<0.05], "The objectives of the curriculum are appropriate for the students' preliminary knowledge of English" [t=4.14 (448), p<0.05], "The coursebook of the curriculum is appropriate for the students' level" [t=3.76 (448), p<0.05] and "The content of the coursebook is comprehensible" [t=1.58 (448), p<0.05]. Finally, taking the means of the opinions of the teachers' and students' regarding all the items of context into consideration, a significant difference was determined [t=2.77 (448), p<0.05].

The analysis of the teachers' and the students' opinions in terms of the input component of the curriculum is seen in Table 5.

Tablo 5.
The Mean, Standard Deviation and t test Results Relating with the Input Component

Input Evaluation	Teacher N= 35		Student N= 415				
Item Number	$\bar{X}$	SS	$\bar{X}$	SS	t	Sd	P
25. The audio visual materials of the curriculum help the students learn easily.	2.40	1.03	2.87	1.21	2.27	448	.02*
26. The audio visual materials of the curriculum attract the students' attention.	2.25	1.06	2.66	1.12	2.08	448	.03*
27. The audio visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the students' language skills.	2.40	1.06	2.83	1.09	2.25	448	.02*
28. The classwork of the curriculum helps the students learn easily.	3.37	1.11	3.13	1.09	1.25	448	.21
29. The classwork of the curriculum attracts the students' attention.	3.02	1.12	2.72	1.06	1.63	448	.10
30. The classwork of the curriculum has positive effects on the students' language skills.	3.40	.91	3.13	1.09	1.41	448	.15
Total	16.85	.82	17.36	.25	.55	448	.58

* p< .05

As it can be seen in Table 5, some significant differences between the arithmetical means of the teachers' and students' opinions regarding the input component were determined about the following items, "The audio visual materials of the curriculum help the students learn easily" [t=2.27 (448), p<0.05], "The audio visual materials of the curriculum attract the students' attention" [t=2.08 (448), p<0.05] and "The audio visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the students' language skills" [t=2.25 (448), p<0.05].

In Table 6, the analysis of the teachers' and the students' opinions in terms of the process component can be seen.

Tablo 6.
The Mean, Standard Deviation and t test Results Relating with the Process Component

Process Evaluation	Teacher N= 35		Student N= 415				
Item Number	$\overline{X}$	SS	$\overline{X}$	SS	t	sd	P
38. Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum.	4.82	.38	4.13	.94	4.30	448	.00*
39. When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum.	4.80	.47	3.79	1.01	5.79	448	.00*
40. The consolidating homework is given to the students about the newly learned topics.	4.34	.68	3.70	1.05	3.49	448	.00*
41. The curriculum enables the students to participate in the course actively.	4.48	.61	3.98	.92	3.17	448	.00*
42. The number of the formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough.	3.85	.69	4.13	.99	1.60	448	.10
43. The program has activities suitable for pair and group work.	3.57	.94	3.87	1.02	1.68	448	.09
46. The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be applied.	4.48	.50	3.94	.98	3.23	448	.00*
47. During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the students' problems about English is enough.	4.51	.50	3.93	.95	3.52	448	.00*
Total	34.88	.47	31.50	.31	3.12	448	.00*

* p< .05

As can be observed in Table 6, some significant differences between the arithmetical means of the teachers' and students' opinions regarding the process component were found about the following items, "Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum" [t=4.30 (448), p<0.05], "When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum" [t=5.79 (448), p<0.05], "The consolidating homework is given to the students about the newly learned subjects" [t=3.49 (448), p<0.05], "The curriculum enables the students to participate in the course actively" [t=3.17 (448), p<0.05], "The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be used" [t=3.23 (448), p<0.05] and "During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the students' problems about English is enough" [t=3.52 (448), p<0.05]. Besides, in terms of the means of the opinions of the the teachers' and students' regarding all the items of process, a significant difference was found [t=3.12 (448), p<0.05].

The analysis of the teachers' and the students' opinions in terms of the product component is shown in Table 7.

Tablo 7.
The Mean, Standard Deviation and t test Results Related with the Product Component

Product Evaluation	Teacher N= 35		Student N= 415				
Item number	$\bar{X}$	SS	$\bar{X}$	SS	t	sd	P
2. The curriculum meets the students' individual needs.	3.08	1.01	3.33	.94	1.48	448	.13
4. The curriculum meets the students' individual interests.	2.74	.81	3.05	1.02	1.77	448	.07
5. The curriculum meets the students' characteristics needs.	2.80	.63	2.88	1.04	.48	448	.63
6. The curriculum meets the students' existing needs related with English.	2.82	.92	3.00	.92	1.06	448	.28
7. The curriculum forms a basis for the students' future needs related with English.	3.05	.87	3.18	1.04	.68	448	.49
8. The curriculum contributes to the students' work related with their fields.	2.62	.94	2.77	1.09	.74	448	.45
31. The curriculum motivates the students to learn English.	3.02	.92	3.16	.91	.82	448	.41
37. The projects assigned according to the curriculum affect the students' language skills positively.	3.37	.94	3.09	.93	1.70	448	.08
45. The curriculum increases the students' vocabulary knowledge in English.	3.34	.80	3.00	.95	2.02	448	.04*
48. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying English.	3.05	.93	3.11	1.07	.28	448	.77
49. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the habit of studying in groups.	2.54	.91	2.70	1.13	.83	448	.40
50. The curriculum gives the students the opportunity to use their knowledge.	3.28	.75	3.15	.97	.79	448	.42
52. The students' improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory.	2.74	.81	3.10	1.01	2.03	448	.04*
53. The students' improvement of English writing skills is satisfactory.	2.62	.91	3.22	1.01	3.36	448	.00*
54. The students' improvement of English listening skills is satisfactory.	2.02	.92	2.77	1.08	3.94	448	.00*
55. The students' improvement of English speaking skills is satisfactory.	2.11	.79	2.65	1.07	2.91	448	.00*
56. The students' improvement of English grammar is satisfactory.	2.22	.77	2.94	1.02	4.02	448	.00*
58. The knowledge of English the students acquire at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory.	2.71	.71	3.11	.97	2.37	448	.01*
59. The English skills the students acquire at the end of the curriculum are satisfactory.	2.62	.73	3.06	.97	2.60	448	.01*
60. The curriculum complies with the students' courses in their fields of study.	2.11	.90	2.44	1.07	1.75	448	.08
61. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for their fields of study.	2.20	.93	2.47	1.07	1.48	448	.13
62. The curriculum helps the students to acquire the knowledge of English they need for various business areas.	2.20	.90	2.53	1.08	1.80	448	.07
Total	59.37	1.94	64.81	.75	2.05	448	.04*

* $p < .05$

As it is seen in Table 7, some significant differences between the arithmetical means of the teachers' and students' opinions concerning product component were observed about the following items, "The curriculum increases the students' vocabulary knowledge in English" [$t=2.02$ (448), $p<0.05$], "The students' improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory"

[t=2.03 (448), p<0.05], "The students' improvement of English writing skills is satisfactory" [t=3.36 (448), p<0.05], "The students' improvement of English listening skills is satisfactory" [t=3.94 (448), p<0.05], "The students' improvement of English speaking skills is satisfactory" [t=2.91 (448), p<0.05], "The students' improvement of English grammar is satisfactory" [t=4.02 (448), p<0.05], "The knowledge the students acquire in English at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory" [t=2.37 (448), p<0.05] and "The skills the students acquire in English at the end of the curriculum is satisfactory" [t=2.60 (448), p<0.05]. Moreover, a significant difference was found regarding the means of the teachers' and students' opinions related with all the items of the product component [t=2.05 (448), p<0.05].

Discussion

It is possible to conclude that the differences concerning the items on the context component emerge from the differences between the teachers' and students' expectations from the curriculum. Namely, the expectations of the teachers might be higher than the students' or the teachers and students might comment differently on the appropriateness of the curriculum and the evaluation criteria of the students' level. In the researches conducted by Mersinligil (2002) and Büyükduman (2001), the findings obtained about the appropriateness of the book for the students' level and the contents of the book are similar to the findings obtained in this research. Unlike the findings of this research, in the research conducted by Yılmaz (2003), it was found that the preliminary knowledge of the students was not adequate for the curriculum and they needed some support. Al-Thuwaini (1986) evaluated the approaches of the teachers and advisors to Social Sciences in Saudi Arabia and didn't find a significant difference between the arithmetical means of the opinions. Furthermore, it was seen that the difficulty level of the curriculum was not convenient for the students. This is a finding which doesn't support the teachers' approach in this research.

Considering the findings of the input component, it is very thought-provoking to oserve that the teachers do not believe in a sufficient contribution of audio visual materials to the improvement of the students and the curriculum. This result shows that audio visual materials may not have been used efficiently during the curriculum or may not have positive effects on the objectives of the curriculum. Nam (2005) found that the means of the teachers' opinions in terms of audio visual materials was higher than the students', which supports the findings of this research. In contrast to the findings obtained in this research, there was no significant difference between the arithmetical means of the teachers' and students' opinions concerning audio visual materials in Mersinligil's (2002) research.

In the research conducted by Mersinligil (2002), the opinions received from the teachers and administrators on the process component demonstrated that there were significant differences about the items concerning homework and exercises. This result supports the findings in this research. However, the fact that no significant difference was found regarding revision included in the curriculum does not comply with this research. As opposed to the findings of this research, Mersinligil found a significant difference regarding pair and group work between the arithmetical means of the teachers' and students' opinions. In the research conducted by Yılmaz (2003), a significant difference was observed concerning the item which expressed that the curriculum enables the students to participate into the activities efficiently. It supports the findings obtained in this research.

Regarding the product component, the researches conducted by Mersinligil (2002), Yılmaz (2004), Büyükduman (2001), Griffee (1999) and Tung (1996) reached similar results about the improvement of English vocabulary, reading, writing, listening, speaking and grammar. The

noteworthy point in the research is that while there is no significant difference in the items "The curriculum helps the students acquire the knowledge of English for their fields of study and various business areas" and "The curriculum complies with the students' courses in their fields", the teachers disagree on them. This finding can be related to the indication that the implemented curriculum was prepared ignoring the requirements of the the students' fields of study and business areas. According to the findings obtained, it is found that the mean of the teachers' opinions was higher than the mean of the students' opinions regarding the contribution of the curriculum to the students' vocabulary knowledge in English. Cosequently, from the students' point of view, the vocabulary knowledge they acquired at the end of the curriculum is not as sufficient as the teachers believe.

Conclusion and Recommendations

According to the responses to the scales representing English II curriculum components such as context, input, process and product, we conclude that, mostly, teachers and students tend to support all four of these curriculum components. However, we noted significant and substantial differences in the support given to the four components of the curriculum. Some significant differences concerning some items of the context, input, process and product components of the curriculum were observed. According to the findings obtained from the arithmetical means of the components, the reason why there is no significant difference among the means of the all items related with the input component might be explained as the higher mean of the teachers' opinions regarding the classwork and the higher mean of the students' opinions regarding audio visual materials. One of the most considerable reasons of the differences among the means concerning the context, process and product components might be explained by the fact that the means of the students' opinions are relatively higher than the teachers'. This result indicates that while the students' perceptions are higher, the teachers' expectations are higher from the components of the curriculum.

Based on the findings of the research, the following suggestions were developed for the implementing staff of the program: (1) It may be recommended that both teachers and students should take part in the selection of the course book of the program. (2) It is possible to advise that the audio visual materials of the curriculum should be varied and used to complement instructional methods. (3) It is suggested that the interaction of the process component which has a high arithmetical mean is high, with other components be observed. (4) The activities related with speaking and listening skills should be emphasized. In addition, the students' needs for their fields of the study and business life must be diagnosed and the process and objectives of the curriculum must be reestablished accordingly. (5) Determining which items reveal significant differences between the teachers' and students' opinions regarding the components and their reasons, the expectations of both groups should be met.

Based on the findings of the research, the following suggestions were developed for programmers: (1) The effect of the students' preliminary knowledge on determining the objectives of the program might be debated. Moreover, an analysis based on teachers' and students' opinions may be done to specify the criteria for the selection of the course book. (2) The variety of audio visual materials used at university level and their effect on the instruction of English might be analyzed by especially considering the students' opinions and observed during the application. (3) It might be questioned why both teachers and students declare their opinions as "I completely agree" or "I agree" concerning of the curriculum does not have a positive effect at the same rate on the other components of the curriculum. (4) It is advisable to make a study about the activities, instructional methods and materials by getting the expert opinions to improve speaking and listening skills at university level. Moreover, by taking the

opinions of the university instructors, graduates and managers in various business areas, English needed for both areas might be determined and reflected to English programs. (5) At the end of the research, the components with low means and which indicate significant differences should be reassessed by collecting new data, observing them and interviewing with the teachers and students.

References

Al-Thuwaini, S. I. (1986). *Attitudes of supervisors and teachers toward the social studies curriculum in Saudi Arabian elementary schools*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 47 (08) 2989.

Aslan, O. (2003). *Türkiye'de yabancı dil öğretme ve öğrenmede karşılaşılan sorunları çözümlemeye yönelik bir öneri: Yabancı dil öğretimi ve öğreniminde internet kullanımı.* Akademik Bilişim Konferansı, Çukurova Üniversitesi.

Bayram, N. (2004). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS ile veri analizi*. Bursa: Ezgi Kitabevi.

Büyükduman, F. İ. (2001). *İlköğretim okullarında görev yapan İngilizce öğretmenlerinin Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı ikinci kademe İngilizce öğretim programına ilişkin görüşleri.* Yüksek Lisans Tezi Çalışması, Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İstanbul.

Candoli, I. C., Cullen, K., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1997). *Superintendent performance evaluation: Current practice and directions for improvement*. Boston: Kluwer.

Erden, M. (1995). *Eğitimde program değerlendirme*. Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.

Gally, J. (1984, April). *The evaluation component.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Gilchrist, R. S. and Bernice R. R. (1974). *Curriculum development (A humanized Systems approach).* California: Lear Siegler, Inc./Fearon Publishers.

Gözütok, F. D. (Güz 2003). *«Türkiye'de program geliştirme çalışmaları»*, Milli Eğitim Dergisi: 160-1.

Granger, A., Grierson, J., Quirino, T. R., & Romano (1965). *Training in planning, monitoring, and evaluation for agricultural research management: Manual 4–Evaluation*. The Hague: International Service for National Agricultural Research.

Griffe, D. T. (1999). *Course evaluation by quantitative and qualitative methods*. A dissertation for the degree of the Doctor of Education. Curriculum Instruction and Technology in Education, Temple University, USA.

Guba, E. G., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (1968). *Evaluation: The process of stimulating, aiding, and abetting insightful action.* In R. Ingle & W. Gephart (Eds.), Problems in the training of educational researchers. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Hamilton, D. (1976). *Curriculum evaluation.* London: Open Books Publishing Limited. Harrison, A. S. (1993). *An evaluation model for middle school counseling and guidance.* Old Dominion University.

Hovardaoğlu, S. (2000). *Davranış bilimleri için araştırma teknikleri.* Ankara: VE-GA Yayınları.

Karasar, N. (1999). *Bilimsel araştırma yöntemi.* Ankara: Nobel Yayın Dağıtım.

Kelly, A. V. (1999). *The curriculum.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing Limited.

Mersinligil, G. (2002). *İlköğretim dört ve beşinci sınıflarda uygulanan İngilizce dersi öğretim programının değerlendirilmesi (Adana İli Örneği).* Doktora Tezi Çalışması, Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elazığ.

Middlewood, David and Neil Burton (2001). *Managing the Curriculum.* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Nam, J. M. (2005). *Perceptions of Korean college students and teachers about communication- based English instruction: Evaluation of a college EFL curriculum in South Korea.* A dissertation for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of The Ohio State University.

Nevo, D. (1974). *Evaluation priorities of students, teachers, and principals.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus. Ornstein, A. C. and Hunkins F. P. (1988). "Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues". *New Jersey: Prentice Hall.*

Sanders, J. R. (1994). *The program evaluation standarts.* California: SAGEPublications, Inc.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development.* London: Heinemann.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1969). *Evaluation as enlightenment for decision-making. In A. Walcott (Ed.), Improving educational assessment and an inventory of measures of affective Behavior.* Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Nevo, D. (1976, Winter). *The availability and importance of evaluation information within the school.* Studies in Educational Evaluation, 2, 203-9.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Webster, W. J. (1988). *Evaluation as an administrative function.* In N. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 569-601). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1995). *Evaluation of superintendent performance: Toward a general model. In A. McConney (Eds), Toward a unified model of educational personnel evaluation*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Millman, J. (1995, December). *A proposed model for superintendent Evaluation*. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 9(4), 383-410.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Candoli, C., & Nicholls, C. (1995). *A portfolio for evaluation of school superintendents. Kalamazoo*: Center for Research on Educational Accountability and Teacher Evaluation, The Evaluation Center, Western Michigan University.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1997-a). *Strategies for institutionalizing evaluation: revisited.* Occasional Paper Series #18. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2003-b). *Institutionalizing evaluation in schools.* In T. Kellaghan & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.), The international handbook of educational evaluation (Chapter 34). Boston: Kluwer.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Gullickson, A. R., & Wingate, L. A. (2002). *The spirit of Consuelo: An evaluation of Ke Aka Ho'ona.* Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Evaluation Center.

Tung, C. (1996). *An evaluation of English language instruction in colleges/universities in Taiwan*. A dissertation for the degree of Doctor, Florida International University, Miami-Florida.

Turgut, M.F. (1997). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme metotları*. Ankara: Gül Yayınevi.

Webster, W. J. (1975, March). "The organization and functions of research and evaluation in large urban school districts." *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC.*

Wiles, J. and Bondi J. (2002). *Curriculum development-A guide to practice-.* New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.

Worthern, B. R., Sanders J. R. and Fitzpatrick J. L. (1997). *Program evaluation – Alternative approaches and practical guidelines-*. New York: Longman, Inc.

Yıldırım, C. (1999). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme.* Ankara: ÖSYM Yayınları, 1999-4.

Yılmaz, C. (2005). *«İngilizce öğretmenliği bölümlerindeki öğrencilerin iletişimsel dil gereksinimleri ne ölçüde karşılanıyor?»*. Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 19, 92-103.